

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful examination of the application. However, in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

To further the prosecution of the present application, claims 10, 12, 13, 16, and 17 have been canceled. In addition, claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11, 14, and 15 have been amended to clarify the differences between the present invention and the applied prior art.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-14 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0028408, hereinafter Arima. Arima discloses a digital broadcasting system that transmits video information with information that can be printed out by a viewer. To use the Arima system, the viewer presets printout instructions using the screen display illustrated in Figure 7 of Arima. Specifically, if the viewer wants to printout any of the recipes, profile, or background, the viewer checks the appropriate box in button array 7C. Then at a later time, when the signals are received, if the viewer has pre-inserted an instruction to print certain data, the data is printed when it is received by the viewer.

To clarify the distinctions between the present invention and Arima, the independent claims have been amended. For example, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the control signal including an instruction to start printing is included in a broadcasting signal that is received at a time different from a time when a data broadcasting signal including the printout data is received. As set forth above, the control to printout certain information in Arima is input by the operator using the

Claim 14 has been similarly amended to clarify that the control signal including an instruction to start printing the printout data from a received data broadcasting signal is different from the received data broadcasting signal that includes printout data. Accordingly, claim 14 is also patentable over Arima for the reasons discussed above.

Claim 17 depends from claim 14 and is thus also patentable over Arima at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 14.

Claims 4, 9 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arima in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,695,880, hereinafter Johnson. However, the portions of Johnson relied upon by the Examiner do not overcome the deficiency of the independent claims 1, 5, and 14, which are discussed above. Accordingly, claims 4, 9, and 15 are patentable over the applied prior art at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claims from which they depend.

Claims 8, 15, and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arima in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,848,082, hereinafter Summers. The Examiner relies upon Summers' teaching that subsequent use of received data could be accomplished at a pre-selected time, upon sensing of an event or completion of a prior program, or upon user command. However, Summers does not teach or suggest that the control signal is sent in a different broadcast signal than is the printout data. Accordingly, claims 8, 15, and 16 are also patentable over Arima in view of Summers.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this Amendment, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: June 25, 2007

By: 
William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620